REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Official Action dated April 13, 2009. Claims 10 and 14 have been amended, and claim 18 has been cancelled; as such claims 10-14, 17, 19-25, and 27-29 remain pending in this application. Claims 10, 14, 19 and 25 are independent claims. Reconsideration and allowance is requested in view of the claim amendments and the following remarks.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Support for the amendments can be found in ¶0065 and ¶0074 of the associated PG Pub, which recite:

> [0065] The CCU 20 is capable of converting a video signal received from the imaging apparatus 10 through typically an optical fiber cable as an optical signal into a signal in the HD SDI format and outputting the signal in the HD SDI format to the meta-data addition apparatus 40 through an HD SDI cable. In addition, the CCU 20 is also capable of extracting camera-setting meta data from the video signal. Further, the **CCU 20 also passes on a return video signal received from the meta-data synthesis apparatus 60** to be described later to the imaging apparatus 10.
>
> [0074] In this way, **the meta-data synthesis apparatus 60 is capable of returning a meta-data-synthesized video signal to the imaging apparatus 10** as a return video signal typically in a configuration of distributing the function of a monitoring system. Thus, on the basis of the returned meta-data synthesized video signal, the imaging apparatus 10 is capable of displaying an image with meta data superimposed thereon on the display unit 108.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102/103

Claims 19-20, 23, 25, 27, and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2004/0174451 to Okazaki et al. ("Okazaki").

Claims 21-22, 24, and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Okazaki in view of U.S. Pub. 2005/0104976 to Currans ("Currans").

To qualify as prior art, the effective filing date of a reference must be before the date of invention by the applicant for patent. The final Office Action relies upon Okazaki. The effective

filing date of Okazaki is March 4, 2004, the priority date for Okazaki is irrelevant for purposes of rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

The present application claims priority to Japanese Patent Application No. P2003-101837 filed on April 4, 2003.

The effective filing date of Okazaki is after the priority date of the present application. Okazaki, therefore, does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102 or 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicant further notes that a certified copy of the priority document was filed on March 26, 2004. A certified translation is forthcoming.

Absent Okazaki, Currans fails to form the basis for a proper rejection of claims 19-20, 23, 25, 27, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-12, 14, 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,592,301 to Shimada ("Shimada") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,130,717 o Arai et al. ("Arai").

Claim 10 now recites:

> *A video-signal recording/reproduction apparatus comprising:*
>
> *a recording/reproduction unit for recording a video signal generated by an imaging apparatus as a video signal with every frame thereof, including additional meta data related to said video signal, onto and from a recording medium and generating a reproduced video signal including said meta data; and*
>
> *a meta-data synthesis apparatus for producing a synthesized video signal by extracting at least a part of said meta data from said reproduced video signal including said meta data added to every frame and*

synthesizing said extracted part with a video portion of the reproduced video signal;

wherein said imaging apparatus receives said synthesized video signal including said meta data and displays said meta-data, from said synthesized video signal, at the imaging apparatus synchronously as the video signal is recorded by the recording/reproduction unit.

Shimada and Arai, either alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest an "*imaging apparatus [that] receives said synthesized video signal including said meta data and displays said meta-data, from said synthesized video signal, at the imaging apparatus synchronously as the video signal is recorded by the recording/reproduction unit.*"

Shimada discloses a video camera having an electronic view finder 14 that can show a user information pertaining to the current video capture process, such as date, operating mode, elapsed time, etc.

Arai is relied upon to rejection the portion of claim 10 that concern reproduction of the recorded video. Specifically, Arai includes a video recorder 225 capable of outputting video to display 223. As such, display 223 may be used to view recorded video.

However, claim 10 does not simply disclose storing and playing video, nor does the claim simply disclose playing back video containing meta-data.

Claim 10, recites "*imaging apparatus [that] receives said synthesized video signal including said meta data and displays said meta-data, from said synthesized video signal, at the imaging apparatus synchronously as the video signal is recorded by the recording/reproduction unit.*" This is a distinction is function of the device that separates it from both Shimada and Arai, alone or in combination.

Neither references discloses providing recorded data information to the display of the camera *synchronously as the video signal is recorded by the recording/reproduction unit.*